

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

TRAVIS GLENN,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMERICO,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00184-TL

ORDER ON MOTION FOR
DEFAULT JUDGMENT


This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Travis Glenn's Motion for Default Judgment. Dkt. No. 16. Having reviewed the docket and relevant briefing, the Court DENIES the motion.

Mr. Glenn initiated the instant action on February 8, 2024, when he filed a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis with the Court. Dkt. No. 1. Following the Court's order granting that motion, Mr. Glenn filed his complaint on February 13, 2024. Dkt. Nos. 4 (order granting motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis), 5 (complaint). Summons was electronically issued as to Defendant on February 26, 2024. Dkt. No. 14.

1 In his motion, Plaintiff states, “It is the Plaintiff’s understanding that the court has
2 successfully completed the process of service upon the defendant as of February 26th[,] 2024.”
3 Dkt. No. 16 at 2 (emphasis omitted). However, while the clerk of the court *issued* the summons
4 to Defendant, it is Plaintiff’s duty to then *serve* that summons, along with the complaint, within
5 the time allowed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(b) (“If the summons
6 is properly completed, the clerk must sign, seal, and issue it to the plaintiff for service on the
7 defendant”). Plaintiff is then required to make proof of service to the Court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P.
8 4(l)(1).

9 Plaintiff has not completed service on Defendant Americo or provided proof of service to
10 the Court. Plaintiff has made a Motion for Service of Summonses by the Court, which the Court
11 will address separately. Dkt. No. 17. As Defendant has not yet been properly served, the Court
12 DENIES Plaintiff’s motion without prejudice.

13 Dated this 28th day of March 2024.

14 
15 Tana Lin
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24